



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,944	08/04/2003	John Kolboern Roedseth	DN2003129	5204

27280 7590 06/16/2006

THE GOODYEAR TIRE & RUBBER COMPANY
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 823
1144 EAST MARKET STREET
AKRON, OH 44316-0001

EXAMINER

KNABLE, GEOFFREY L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1733

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/633,944

Applicant(s)

ROEDSETH ET AL.

Examiner

Geoffrey L. Knable

Art Unit

1733

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-4 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5 and 6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on May 23, 2006 has been entered.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 1-4 remain withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 10-5-2005.
4. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baldoni et al. (US 6,360,802) taken in view of at least one of [Caretta (US 3,598,673), Byerley (US 6,457,505) and Felten et al. (US 4,239,579)].

These references are applied for the same reasons as set forth in the last office action. As to the amendment to claim 5, the bead locks of Baldoni et al. are connected to a central screw (11) of shaft (10) through parts 14/16/etc.

5. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over [Caretta (US 3,598,673) or Landsness (US 4,780,170) or Olbert et al. (US 3,853,653 - for claim 5 only)] taken in view of at least one of Baldoni et al. (US 6,360,802) and Kneip (US 4,976,804) and further in view of at least one of [Caretta (US 3,598,673 - only for

Art Unit: 1733

the rejections not based on Caretta), Byerley (US 6,457,505) and Felten et al. (US 4,239,579)].

These references are applied for the same reasons as set forth in the last office action. As to the amendment to claim 5, with respect to Caretta, use of a central screw to effect axial movements rather than using a rack and pinion would have been obvious for the same reasons detailed in the first office action (dated 5-3-2005) with respect to essentially this same limitation in claim 6. With respect to Landsness, note screw 58 for axial movement of sleeves 41 and thus bead locks, it being considered that this screw is relatively centrally located and further, the main drive shaft also clearly supports the entire drum and thus also the bead lock segments, it not being considered that the present language avoids this interpretation. With respect to Olbert et al., the internals of the drum are not detailed and thus a central screw/shaft is not specifically shown. Olbert et al. does however clearly desire that the sides of the drum "B" and "C", and thus also the bead locks, are axially movable (e.g. col. 3, line 68 - col. 4, line 2). To effect such movement, the artisan would have been motivated to adopt well known and conventional means used in this art to effect such movements, it being extremely well known and conventional in this art to use a central screw in a central shaft to effect symmetrical axial movements of side drum parts - Baldoni et al. and Kneip as well as Byerley and Felten et al. are exemplary of this well known expedient in tire building drums - use of such to effect the axial movements in Olbert et al. would therefore have been obvious and would provide a connection between the bead locks and the central screw/shaft as now claimed in claim 5.

Art Unit: 1733

6. Applicant's arguments filed May 23, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant has argued that none of the references disclose each bead lock connected to a central screw of a central drive shaft, specific mention being made of Baldoni, it being urged that this reference "teaches a piston 37 and is not actuated by a central screw 11." For reasons noted in the statement of rejection above, each of the references is considered to suggest or render obvious this requirement. As to Baldoni in particular, while a piston 37 is involved with support of the bead locks, this does not mean that the bead locks are not connected to the central screw - note that this central screw effects axial movement of the bead locks (e.g. compare figs. 4-5) and thus is certainly connected thereto. It should also be noted that the bead locks of the present application also include a piston/cylinder arrangement but nevertheless are read to be "connected" to the central screw within the meaning of the now claimed connection.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Geoffrey L. Knable whose telephone number is 571-272-1220. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on 571-272-1226. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1733

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Geoffrey L. Knable
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1733

G. Knable
June 12, 2006